Sec. 32

EQUAL RIGHTS

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

Vol. 30, No. 8 OCTOBER - NOVEMBER, 1944

Coming in on a Pledge and a Prayer

PLEDGE GIVEN BY SENATOR ALBEN W. BARKLEY, MAJORITY LEADER, SEPTEMBER 19, 1944, IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE:

"As soon as it is possible for a vote to be had on the joint resolution (Equal Rights Amendment) under circumstances which will represent the views of the Senate by a two-thirds majority, when there is a sufficient attendance of Senators really to represent the Senate and to give the amendment the kind of send-off which I presume its supporters would like to have when it is submitted to the States, I shall co-operate with the Senator from Iowa, with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and with anyone else, including all these organizations, in undertaking to obtain a vote upon the joint resolution at the earliest possible date.

"I do not know that I need say anything further. I am sure that without undue delay and long before the legislatures meet in the 45 States in which legislatures will meet in January or February of the coming year, or at least early in the year, which will be the earliest possible date upon which any legislature could take action, the U. S. Senate will have acted in ample time for the House to take such action as it may see fit to take."

OCT 27 19

Paraphrasing the hymn of our noble Brothers of the Air, as they approach the end of their journey, so we, believing in equality of opportunity for men and women in the post-war world, as we approach the end of the journey toward equality of rights between men and women, begun in 1848, can appropriately chant that we are "coming in on a PLEDGE and a PRAYER." Prayer and work to supplement the pledge are essential.

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

ANOTHER recess has been taken by the United States Senate without action on the Equal Rights Amendment. The Senate adjourned September 21 until after the elections.

Copious explanations were given, on the Senate floor and off, for failure to fulfill the promises made to supporters of the Amendment, such as: too few Senators would return to Washington for the short session before the elections; a Constitutional amendment was too important to be hurried through; the Senate would filibuster if it was brought up; there would never be a quorum; and so on ad infinitum.

Indication of the political significance of the Amendment lies in the prominence given to a discussion of its postponement before adjournment. Senator Guy M. Gillette (Democrat, of Iowa) made a special trip to Washington, to be here at the first session after the summer recess, to ask for a vote on the amendment as he had promised. He has been a magnificent champion of equality of rights between men and women now and always. Arrangements were completed with the Senate leaders. Many Senators report that they were deluged with letters and telegrams urging them to work for immediate passage of the amendment. Several of our friends came all the way back from their homes for the express purpose of voting on this measure.

On September 5, "opening-day" of the new session, Senator Gillette announced on the floor that he would make a motion for a vote on the Amendment the following week.

On September 12 Senator Gillette announced on the floor of the Senate that he would be unable to bring the measure up for a vote that week as planned, because of the absence of a large number of Senators, but that he would call up the Amendment "at the earliest time when there is a representative attendance in the Senate."

"The Washington News (see page 69) and the New

(Continued on Page 66)

EQUAL RIGHTS

Official Organ of the

NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

Capitol Hill Washington, D. C.

Published Monthly at
144 B Street, N. E., Washington, D. C.

Entered as second class matter at the post-office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879

Subscription $1.50 a Year
Foreign Subscription, $2.00

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACTS OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AND MARCH 3, 1933.

Of EQUAL RIGHTS, official organ, National Woman's Party, published monthly at Washington, D. C., and printed at 406 W. Redwood St., Baltimore, Md., for October, 1944.

District of Columbia: ss.

Before me, a Notary Public, in and for the District aforesaid, personally appeared Dora G. Ogle, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that she is the Business Manager of the EQUAL RIGHTS publication, and that the following is, to the best of her knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse side of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, National Woman's Party, 144 B Street, N. E., Washington, D. C.

Editor: Anna Kelton Wiley, 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C.

Business Manager: Mrs. Dora G. Ogle, 144 B St. N. E., Washington, D. C.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.)

National officers: Chairman, Miss Alice Paul, N. J.; 1st Vice-Chairman, Mrs. Clara Snell Wolfe, Ohio; 2nd Vice-Chairman, Mrs. Margaret Williams, N. Y.; 3rd Vice-Chairman, Mrs. Jane Norman Smith, Vt.; Secretary, Dr. Margaret Sebree, Ky.; Treasurer, Miss Laura M. Berrien, Ga.; Finance Chairman, Dr. Florence A. Armstrong, Va.; Endowment Chairman, Miss Marguerite Smith, Mass.; Advisory Council Chairman, Mrs. Nora Stanton Barney, Conn.; Congressional Co-Chairmen, Mrs. U. S. Guyer, Kan.; Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, Pa. National Council Members: Mrs. Ethel Adamson, N. J.; Mrs. Nina E. Allender, Ill.; Mrs. Alma H. Ambrose, Md.; Dr. Emily Barringer, Conn.; Mrs. Estelle Bjerg, Ariz.; Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy, Va.; Mrs. Lois Buenzli, Pa.; Miss Aurelle Burnside, Ark.; Mrs. A. R. Colvin, Minn.; Mrs. Clara C. Conroy, Ga.; Mrs. Edith B. Conway, Mass.; Mrs. Rosa Cunningham, Ia.; Mrs. Serena Foley Davis, Pa.; Miss Mary E. Downey, D. C.; Mrs. Walter Ferguson, Okla.; Mrs. Elizabeth Forbes, Md.; Miss Edith Goode, Vt.; Mrs. Elsie Graff, Va.; Mrs. Dorothy Granger, Md.; Mrs. Rebekah Greathouse, La.; Mrs. U. S. Guyer, Kan.; Mrs. W. H. Hansen, Ky.; Mrs. M. Lucretia Hayden, Ia.; Miss Elsie Hill, Conn.; Miss Anna B. Hogan, N. J.; Mrs. Edith Houghton Hooker, Md.; Miss Mary C. Kennedy, Ind.; Mrs. Lillian Kerr, Colo.; Mrs. Page Kirk, D. C.; Mrs. H. Lessemann, Cal.; Miss Marie Lockwood, Del.; Mrs. Helen U. Loewen, Pa.; Miss Alma Lutz, Mass.; Miss Jeannette Marks, N. Y.; Mrs. Burnita S. Matthews, Miss.; Mrs. Mary D. McCain, R. I.; Mrs. Charles L. McNary, Ore.; Mrs. Perle S. Mesta, Ariz.; Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, Pa.; Mrs. Phoebe Munnecke, Mich.; Mrs. Mary Murray, N. Y.; Mrs. Ethel Ernest Murrel, Fla.; Mrs. Dora G. Ogle, Md.; Miss Mary E. O'Neill, Mont.; Miss Anita Pollitzer, S. C.; Miss Mabel Pollitzer, S. C.; Mrs. Annette Roberts, Wis.; Mrs. Charles Robbins, Ill.; Miss Lillian Scott, N. M.; Mrs. Sidney M. Smith, Nebr.; Miss Doris Stevens, N. Y.; Mrs. Helen Hunt West, Fla.; Mrs. Robert T. Whitehouse, Me.; Mrs. Anna Kelton Wiley, D. C.; Miss Lizabeth Wiley, Wyo.; Mrs. Lucy Rice Winkler, Cal.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state). There are none.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by her.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the twelve months preceding the date shown above is: (This information is required from daily publications only.)

DORA G. OGLE, Business Manager.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 21st day of September, 1944.
CHAS. E. ALDEN, Notary Public, D. C.
(My commission expires August 27, 1947.)

Coming In On A Pledge And A Prayer

(Continued from First Page)

York Herald Tribune followed this announcement with stories quoting Senator Homer Ferguson (Republican, of Michigan) as blaming the CIO for the delay.

On September 19 a protracted discussion took place on the floor of the Senate, precipitated by Senator Ferguson's charge. Senator Barkley denied the accusation, and contended that it was his interest in seeing the Amendment go forth with the prestige of approval by a large attendance in the Senate that had prompted him to agree to the delay. He denied that he had ever been approached by any member of the CIO or the PAC or any other organization of that sort, or that he even knew their attitude on the amendment. He then gave his reasons for favoring postponement thus:

> "After conferring with members of the Senate on both sides of the Chamber, taking into consideration the difficulty of keeping a quorum here, not only now and up to now, but the even greater difficulty after these conference reports have been disposed of and the emergency legislation has been gotten out of the way, it seemed to me, and it seemed to all those with whom I conferred, without exception, on both sides of the Chamber, that it might be unfortunate to attempt to force the joint resolution before the Senate with a bare majority of the Senate present.
>
> Amending the Constitution of the United States is an important procedure. The Constitution provides that an amendment must in the first place be submitted by a two-thirds vote. Two-thirds of 49, which is a bare majority, would be 33. If 49 Senators were voting, it would require 33 to pass the joint resolution. If, of the 49 Senators, 17 voted against the measure, it would not received the required majority. I have explained, and I feel now that the amendment, when submitted, ought to go before the country with a substantial backing, not of a bare two-thirds of a bare majority, but a two-thirds vote of a substantial attendance of the Senate and of the House also when the joint resolution is acted on. Thirty-three voting for it out of 49 would be only 1 more than one-third of the Senate, and I have assumed, and I now assume, that those interested in the joint resolution want it to pass, and want the amendment to be ratified by the required number of States."

After full explanation of the reasons for postponement Senator Barkley closed his speech with the cheering pledge already quoted.

Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney (Democrat, of Wyoming) spoke in support of the statement made by Senator Barkley, and said, in part:

> "I have always been a supporter of the Equal Rights Amendment. I have always advocated that it be submittted to the people of the United States. I believe that now; and I believe it should be submitted without delay."

Senator Wallace H. White (Republican, of Maine), Minority Party leader of the Senate, concurred with the Democratic leader in regard to delaying the vote until after the elections. He said, in part:

> "I think I am within the bounds of truth when I say that the decision to postpone this matter was the decision of the majority. . . . I hope the majority will meet its responsibilities. I think I did say on a number of occasions that the majority reached this decision. I do not mind adding now publicly that that decision of the majority had my complete concurrence. I agreed fully with the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Gillette) when he announced that he would not pursue the matter at this time, and I say that the decision not to take it up was wholly justified,

and that I concurred, so far as I had any voice or any authority in the matter, in that decision."

Senator Homer Ferguson (Republican, of Michigan) spoke in protest against the delay in considering the Amendment. He said, in part:

"Mr. President, at the time when consideration of the joint resolution was deferred, not only the majority party but both parties had approved the proposed legislation in their conventions, by making it in effect a part of their platforms; and at the particular time when the measure was coming up, and when the C.I.O. was opposing it, another bill, the road bill, was brought before the Senate. It was voted upon. The Senate has been here for action. I merely wish to say that the facts are as I have stated. If the majority leader says he has received no mail or no intimation that the C.I.O. wanted this matter postponed or did not want it voted upon or was opposed to it, I accept his statement as absolutely true. I am only quoting from my own mail. . . .

"Mr. President, the people will have to drawn their own conclusions. I have drawn mine. The Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader, has drawn his.

"It is apparent, and I have said that I will take his word for it, that so far as he was personally concerned the C. I. O. and the P. A. C. had absolutely nothing to do with it. As a matter of fact, the majority leader did not adjourn this cause. Several weeks ago the Senator from Iowa arose and said that he would like to have a joint resolution brought up upon the floor. After that I received the telegrams to which I have referred. Subsequently the able Senator from Iowa arose upon the floor and said in effect that so far as he was concerned the proposed constitutional amendment would not be brought up.

"Mr. President, we have had other important legislation before us for consideration. I hope the people will be able to have the result of a vote upon this subject at some early date. Not being a member of the majority party, I know that a motion upon my part to bring the matter up at the present time would be of no avail."

Senator Gillette closed the discussion. He said, in part:

"Mr. President, the joint resolution proposing an equal rights amendment to the Constitution was introduced as a bi-partisan measure. If my memory serves me correctly, 16 members of the majority party and 8 members of the minority party joined in its sponsorship. There cannot be the remotest suggestion of party feeling or party interest in connection with the proposal.

"After having introduced the measure I subsequently returned to the Senate and perhaps assumed an authority which I did not have. On the day following Labor Day I arose in the Senate and gave notice that it was my hope and purpose that at some time during the following week, if it conformed to the program of the Senate, I would move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution. At that time the eminent majority leader was absent from the city. I had not conferred with him, and I had not conferred with the distinguished minority leader or with anyone else. I merely gave notice to proceed to the consideration of the proposal.

"Mr. President, of the 24 members who sponsored the proposed legislation, 13 were absent from the city at the time to which I refer. At the present time I believe that a large number of Senators are absent from the city. But Senators who were out of the city, as well as Senators who were in the city, told me that they had understood that no controversial legislation was to be taken up. They called attention to the inadvisability of proceeding on a matter so important as a proposed constitutional amendment when a bare quorum of the Senate was present, if an actual quorum were even present.

"During the following week, in deference to the statements or requests which had been presented to me, I arose and said that I did not intend that week to move to take up consideration of the measure, but that I hoped that at some time before the approaching recess of the Senate, when a working quorum was present, it would permit the joint resolution to be brought up. . . .

"Mr. President, at no time has the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished minority leader, or any of the leadership on this side of the Chamber approached me with the suggestion that I postpone calling up the measure, as I had suggested I hoped to do. Neither has anyone representing the C. I. O., the A. F. of L., the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, or any other labor group approached me with a suggestion that the matter be postponed, or attempted to influence me in any way.

"I have the highest respect for the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Maine, and the Senator from Kentucky. I know they are proceeding with the utmost sincerity. Whatever blame there may be for failure to call up the joint resolution, as I announced was my intention to do, is mine. . . ."

Answer To Editorial In The Washington Post

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Equal Rights

You say, truly, in your editorial on Equal Rights, that many States have anachronistic laws denying rights to women that should be accorded them, and you propose State-by-State "pressure" for revision.

Have you considered the drain such action would entail on the energy of those you affirm are "the weaker sex?" We have been at it 100 years already. We are getting tired of being condemned to dig forever amidst the problems of a bygone age. The America we honor demands the energies of every citizen, man and woman, in helping to solve the problems of today and to plan the reconstruction of tomorrow.

Moreover, what one State Legislature giveth the next taketh away. Our aim is beyond transient law, however well it be drawn.

The three great historic injustices that stand out in the very development of civilization were those against race, creed and sex. The history of democracy is the history of the attempt to overcome them. The agitation for the Bill of Rights and later for the emancipation of the Negro wrote justice toward race and creed into our fundamental law, the Constitution. The Negro teacher in many a district is getting equal pay with white under the fourteenth amendment. Women want that third ancient injustice wiped out through an amendment to our fundamental law which declares that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex."

As for "protective legislation," citizens who have the Constitution behind them do not lack protection.

By the way, as to that appellation "weaker sex". The tables of life expectancy given out by the insurance companies declare that women live longer than men.

FLORENCE L. C. KITCHELT,
Vice Chairman, Connecticut Committee for the Equal Rights Amendment.

New Haven, Conn., July 24, 1944.

Telegram

Shoreham, N. Y., August 8, 1944.

MISS JEANETTE MARKS,
Westport, Essex County, New York.

I don't see how any intelligent person can hesitate to endorse the pending legislation for equal rights for women.

(*Signed*) CHANNING POLLOCK.

Senators Pledge Support Of Amendment

Within the past few weeks many additional Senators have placed themselves on record in favor of the Equal Rights Amendment and have promised to vote for it when it comes up on the floor of the Senate. Inclusion of the Equal Rights plank in both the Republican and Democratic national platforms has influenced many Senators to pledge their support of the Amendment.

Senator Joseph H. Ball (Republican) of Minnesota wrote September 13:

"I have studied the amendment and issue involved and am going to vote to submit it to the States. It does seem to me that only such a provision in our basic law will force some of the States to change their unjust laws and also stop the continual attempts to discriminate against women."

Senator C. Wayland Brooks (Republican) of Illinois wrote September 6:

"This amendment is now awaiting action on the Senate calendar. I have informed my correspondents concerning this measure that I expect to vote for it."

Senator C. D. Buck (Republican) of Delaware wrote August 24:

"Shortly after coming to Washington I went on record as favoring the Equal Rights Amendment. * * * You may count on me to support it when it does reach the Senate."

Senator Arthur Capper (Republican) of Kansas wrote September 13:

"I have been for this legislation ever since it was introduced, and today I am stronger than ever for it. I will do everything in my power to bring it to a vote at the earliest possible moment."

Senator Guy Cordon (Republican) of Oregon wrote August 24:

"I will do all I can to try to get the resolution on the Equal Rights Amendment before the Senate by September 1. * * * You may rest assured that I shall support the amendment."

Senator Dennis Chavez (Democrat) of New Mexico wrote August 25:

"This is to assure you that I shall be present when the Equal Rights Amendment comes up on the floor of the Senate, at which time I will give it my every support."

Senator James J. Davis (Republican) of Pennsylvania wrote September 6:

"One of the planks in the Republican Platform is on the Equal Rights Amendment and is now an issue. We made a declaration for it and I don't see what else a good Republican could do but go along with it, and that's what I expect to do."

Senator Walter F. George (Democrat) of Georgia wrote September 20:

"I have announced to my friends that I would support the Amendment when it is brought before the Senate."

Senator Samuel D. Jackson (Democrat) of Indiana wrote September 14:

"I am in Washington to assist in any way possible on the Equal Rights Amendment."

Senator Edwin C. Johnson (Democrat) of Colorado wrote August 23:

"I shall support the proposed amendment to the Constitution, giving women equal rights, when and if the bill reaches the Senate floor."

Senator William Langer (Republican) of North Dakota wrote September 6 and 12:

"I have been backing the Equal Rights Amendment for a long while. * * * You may be assured that I shall continue to do my very best on this."

Senator Albert W. Hawkes (Republican) of New Jersey wrote September 12:

"When the original resolution, calling for such an amendment to the Constitution, was introduced, I agreed to be one of the sponsors of that measure, because I strongly believe this question should be brought before Congress for proper debate, which is the American way of handling such an issue."

Senator Scott W. Lucas (Democrat) of Illinois wrote August 29:

"If the Equal Rights Amendment comes before the Senate and I am not there, I shall be paired for it."

Senator James E. Murray (Democrat) of Montana wrote September 18:

"I wish to assure you that I am wholeheartedly supporting this legislation which has the approval of our Party. I believe it is very important for the future welfare of our country that American women be given this recognition. Women in the future will play a vital part in the councils of our country and in the advancement of civilization. We can be of great aid to this movement by securing an early passage of this legislation. * * * You may be sure that I will support this bill to the limit."

Senator E. V. Robertson (Republican) of Wyoming telegraphed September 5:

"Am returning to Washington immediately so as to be present in Senate to support Equal Rights Amendment which I sponsored with others."

Senator Elbert Thomas (Democrat) of Utah wrote September 2:

"Relative to your interest in the proposed Equal Rights Amendment, I am happy to assure you of my support of this bill."

Senator James M. Tunnell (Democrat) of Delaware wrote July 8:

"I intend to support the Equal Rights Amendment."

Senator Millard E. Tydings (Democrat) of Maryland wrote September 11:

"Senator Gillette has announced that he hopes to bring up the Equal Rights Amendment very shortly in the Senate. You may be sure that I will do what I can to be helpful in the matter."

Senator Sheridan Downey (Democrat) of California sent word September 14 by his secretary:

"It is Senator Downey's intention to give his energetic support to the Equal Rights Amendment, and if the Senator is not in Washington at the time this measure is considered in the Senate, he has asked to be paired in favor of the bill."

Senator Alben W. Barkley (Democrat) of Kentucky wrote September 16:

"Personally, I am ready to vote on the resolution at this time, or any time, and I am anxious to bring it up at the earliest possible date."

Excerpt from a letter from Dr. Felix Morley

President of Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania

You do not need to be anxious as to my appreciation of the value of the work of the National Woman's Party. In years gone by I was a frequent visitor at the Alva Belmont House and you will find that a good many of your old-timers, like Alice Paul, Doris Stevens and Edith Houghton Hooker, will remember the work I did for the National Woman's Party in the critical period of its formation.

I was even fined $20.00 once, for knocking down a man who was hitting a suffrage picket during a demonstration in front of the White House. I have always felt that this payment, which gave me a police record and hit me hard at the time, entitled me to a sort of honorary membership in the National Woman's Party.

Opposition's Temporary Victory

By MOLLIE MALONEY

Vice Chairman, Industrial Council of N. W. P., and former President of Bindery Women's Union 66 of the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders (A. F. of L.)

On Monday morning, October 2, a conference on the Equal Rights Amendment was held in Washington in the office of Senator Gillette, our chief sponsor in the Senate. Opponents of the Equal Rights Amendment had asked a few days before for the interview. Senator Gillette suggested that some of our representatives attend, and Mrs. Burnita Shelton Matthews, Counsel for the National Woman's Party, and I were present in response to Senator Gillette's invitation. Mrs. Dorothy Shipley Granger was present for the St. Joan's Society.

Mr. William F. Montavon, Director of the Legal Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, opened the discussion. He spoke in vigorous opposition to the Amendment, contending that its passage would have a bad effect on the home. He held that the husband is the natural head of the family, and that giving women equality through this Amendment would serve to disrupt family life. He intimated that the Catholic Church, as a whole, was opposed to the Amendment.

The C. I. O. representative, Attorney Raphael of New York, outlined the strong opposition of the C. I. O. to the Amendment. He said that in the post-war period women would be in keen competition with men. The question of the adoption of the Amendment is therefore of very great seriousness, he contended.

No other opponents presented themselves.

Mrs. Matthews spoke briefly for the Amendment and answered various legal objections that had been advanced.

Mrs. Granger challenged Mr. Montavon's statement that the Catholic Church is opposed to the Amendment. "Only a certain group," she said, "is opposing it. The St. Joan's Society, composed entirely of Catholic women, has endorsed the Amendment."

I was then called to speak on the labor angle in reply to the C. I. O. representative. I have worked at my trade of bookbinding since I was eleven years old, so I think I know why working women need the Amendment. I explained to Senator Gillette that I have been working in New York since 1913 against the no-night-work laws for women and laws limiting their hours of work. These laws have made women lose their jobs, and have taken away their chance to get to the top. I explained that the so-called welfare laws worked in reverse for many of the women. Many highly skilled jobs were lost to bindery women, for example, simply because women could not work an hour or two extra to finish a job. I, myself, was an experienced folding machine operator, receiving $46.50 per week, but I lost this work through the misplaced efforts of well-intentioned women. I had to take other work in the bindery which paid me half of the above wages when the so-called "protective" laws went into operation. All this I related to Senator Gillette to show why restrictive laws applying only to women and not to their male competitors are harmful and why we need the Equal Rights Amendment to make such discriminatory laws impossible.

Senator Gillette gave us a great deal of encouragement. He said he believed the effect of the Amendment would be good for men and women alike, and that he expected to go forward with the Amendment in the Senate immediately after the reconvening of Congress on November 14th.

The discussion closed on a resolute statement by Mr. Montavon that our opponents had succeeded in keeping the Amendment from coming to a vote before the Senate adjourned, and that they would strive to keep it from being voted upon when Congress reconvenes after the elections. The Amendment would then have to go over to another Congress, and its supporters would have to start over again from the beginning.

A Press Comment

GOP SENATORS BLAME CIO FOR EQUAL RIGHTS DELAY

The same CIO that pulled strings behind scenes at the Democratic convention in Chicago is undercutting the equal rights amendment endorsed in the party platform by holding up action in the Senate, according to Republican members of the Senate.

Scheduled for action on the Senate floor this week, consideration of the measure was postponed when Senator Guy M. Gillette (Democrat, of Iowa) announced Tuesday that many interested senators absent from Washington objected to taking it up until they could be on hand for the debate.

"That's not the real reason," said Senator Homer Ferguson (Republican, of Michigan) today. "The majority side is afraid to bring it up because of the flood of CIO telegrams and letters. And they won't bring it up until after the election."

"It just shows how they're going to live up to the party platform. This was a good opportunity to show how the whole party could line up behind a good plank, and they muffed it."

Senator Ferguson said reports from other senators' offices of pressure mail bore out his comment.

Democratic Senatorial pressure is known to have been exerted on Sidney Hillman, chairman of the CIO Political Action Committee, to call off the barrage, on the ground that it wasn't a good idea for Mr. Hillman to try to run the Senate. Mr. Hillman is said to have replied that he was unaware of the campaign.

The unions, spearheaded by the Women's Trade Union League, have been traditionally opposed to the equal rights amendment. They hold that legal restrictions on hours, pay and other conditions of employment are necessary to protect the health and prevent exploitation of women.

The National Woman's Party, leading the fight for the amendment, insists that special protective laws for women make job-getting more difficult, that many discriminatory laws deprive women of their full rights as citizens.

The Republican Party platform of 1944 carries an equal rights plank as it did in 1940.

—(Reprinted from the Washington *Daily News*, Sept. 16, 1944.)

Statement By Nora Barney

Chairman, National Advisory Council, N. W. P.

September 4, 1944.

To the Editor of the New York Times and New York Herald Tribune:

The Equal Rights Amendment is the consummation of one hundred years of effort by lovers of justice and liberty of both sexes—the final step to place American women on an equal and dignified footing with other citizens.

"The Declaration of Sentiments," which was endorsed by the Women's Rights Convention of 1848 at Seneca Falls, New York, emphasized enfranchisement as but one of innumerable rights to be achieved by women. The fact that a woman is not considered a person according to the legal interpretation of the old common law should be more humiliating to the women of 1944 than was the fact of not being a voter to the women of 1918. The Nineteenth Amendment which enfranchised women was one important step in the long sequence, but the Equal Rights Amendment will be the glorious climax—the final achievement of equal citizenship for women.

In 1863, my grandmother, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, sent forth the Call to the Loyal Women of America to attend a convention in Cooper Union. At that Convention, they called upon President Abraham Lincoln to enfranchise all women as well as the Negro. But only the Negro won out, and it was 55 years before women gained the vote.

Now an almost parallel situation has arisen. Through the Fair Practices Act, temporary at present but which will probably become permanent, a Negro woman cannot be discharged or denied employment because she is a Negro, but she can be discharged or denied employment because she is a woman. Again, as during those 55 years, we American women ask that we be put on an equal footing with the Negro by the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment, which will be our *permanent fair practices act.*

The vote was given to women in spite of the opposition of a small minority of now almost forgotten "antis" as they were called. There are always "antis" opposed to every just cause. Just as there were slaves who preferred slavery to freedom, dependence to self reliance, so there are some women who prefer dependence to self-reliance—prefer to be wards of the State rather than have equal citizenship. The bulk of waning opposition comes from two sources. First, from the group of office holders and civil service employees who would lose their jobs if the Equal Rights Amendment passed, because there would no longer be the necessity of two sets of inspectors and bureau heads, one for women and one for men. The health of all workers would come under one head, much to the relief of the overburdened taxpayer. It is, therefore, easy to understand the opposition of those women office holders, few in number but persistent and vociferous. Since their time and fares are paid by the state or nation, they can, without sacrifice, be present at all hearings.

The other group is also actuated by the fear of unemployment, and is imbued with the mistaken notion that if all women were discharged, all men would be employed, or, in reverse, that 10,000 employed women are preventing the employment of 10,000 men. No greater fallacy could possibly exist. Every person discharged, whether man or woman, has the same detrimental effect on employment. If a woman earning, say, $50.00 per week in a factory is laid off, she immediately seeks poorer lodgings and starts doing her own laundry. She has to give up the luxury of a permanent wave and a new dress and a movie. A thousand industries are immediately affected, to a very minute degree of course. But if the lay-off concerns 1,000 or 10,000, or, as might easily be the case, 1,000,000, then indeed will the effect be immediately apparent, and cause the lay-off of thousands of dressmakers, laundry workers, hairdressers, etc., and empty apartments. The reduction of the standard of living of any group immediately causes unemployment. Full employment, either by private industry or the State, must be achieved, or another crisis like the "thirties" will creep up on us sooner or later.

One other argument is frequently used against the Equal Rights Amendment, namely, that it would prevent the granting of privileges to women. As at present worded, it does nothing of the sort. It simply says that women's rights should not be denied or abridged on account of sex. If a kind-hearted legislature wants to present each expectant mother, for instance, with an honorarium of a few thousand dollars, they can still do so, even after the Amendment has become law.

The great women who blazed the trail, selflessly devoting their lives and money to the cause of Equal Rights, have long sinced passed on into eternity, leaving behind, however, an awakened womanhood and a conscious electorate. The cause of Equal Rights has done much to keep the ideals of our Republic and democracy before the American people. With a plank for submission of the Equal Rights Amendment in both the Democratic and Republican platforms, let us hope that the present Congress will put it through just as speedily as possible so that no more valuable time, effort and money will have to be wasted on a measure long overdue. All the energy and inspiration of the women working for this vital reform, this crowning achievement, is needed in the rebuilding of the post-war world.

NORA STANTON BARNEY.

Statement By Margaret A. Hickey

President of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

The war has demonstrated women's capacity for full citizenship. In the office, factory, field, and on the war fronts, women have proved their ability. They have given evidence of their willingness to accept full equality of sacrifice. Laws that would impede women in taking increased responsibility as citizens, or would hamper their effectiveness in economic life of the nation, are outmoded and should be discarded.

Since both the Democratic and Republican parties have incorporated planks in their platform favoring submission by Congress of an amendment on equal rights for men and women, our national legislators should hasten to fulfill the pledges of their parties and pass Congressional legislation enabling the states to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment. This procedure will give the people of the nation an opportunity to express themselves on this historic measure.

Following years of study by our National Federation clubs, in 1937 the biennial convention of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., meeting in Atlantic City, voted to support the Equal Rights Amendment; this action has since been ratified by all subsequent national conventions of the Federation. Our members have worked assiduously to obtain favorable Congressional action on this amendment. Recently representatives of the Federation presented testimony in support of this amendment before both the Republican and Democratic Resolutions Committees. The endorsement of the amendment by the major political parties has given impetus to a concerted drive by our members for passage of the amendment by Congress this fall.

League Of Women Voters And The Amendment

By ALICE MORGAN WRIGHT

Before the Women's Alliance of the First Unitarian Church, Albany, New York, October 2, 1944.

WHEN the vote was won for women in this country, nearly 25 years ago, the first great advance was made in securing equality of rights under the law. The second and final advance will be made by the adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment which is now to be voted on in the Senate of the United States. It is worded:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex." I repeat, "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex."

When this amendment is adopted it will wipe out the thousand and forty laws discriminating against women which still remain on the statute books of the states.

An instance of these laws, to cite one in New York State, is this: If you are a married woman and take in boarders in your home; if you take in sewing or any kind of work to do in your own home, what you earn belongs to your husband, and if he claims your earnings the law will uphold him in doing so. But in the paying of taxes: men and women share that right equally.

Now I think there are no longer any anti-suffragists. I think no one regrets that we have the vote: but regarding the second great advance to complete our equal constitutional status there is still controversy, and it seems that the controversy is always about certain laws which were passed in ours and in some other state legislatures, ostensibly for the protection of women in industry. Therefore I will tell you what I can remember about the origin of those laws and you must forgive me if my reminiscences take us way back to suffrage days.

We read that in the new French Government women are to have the vote. During the years I lived in Paris, 1909 - 1914, I knew some of the French suffragists and often went to their meetings.

Clever women, politically minded; like their men, they held many divergent views. There always seemed to be in France more political parties than you could shake a stick at. These party preferences occupied the minds of the voteless French women to such an extent that they were inclined to discuss political issues in which they had no voice: shaking sticks at each other—rather than working together for the vote and for the efficiency that legal equality would give them. It has taken all this time for them to get that vote.

In England I had the advantage of observing the suffrage campaign from the inside: from the very inside of Holloway prison where I spent two months. The English suffragists thought in terms of principle rather than politics. They were working for a cause: the cause of justice. They were giving their whole attention to getting the vote and at the end of the first world war the vote was theirs.

On my return to New York I worked with the New York State Woman Suffrage Party during the final campaign which brought us victory in our state. There was rejoicing and there were many celebrations. We held a great meeting in Carnegie Hall. The auditorium was crowded. The stage was filled with those of the pioneer suffragists who were still living and with the many able and distinguished women who, after so many years of struggle for justice and equality, had achieved that first great step.

As Dr. Anna Howard Shaw came onto the stage the band, as always at her appearance, broke into "Onward Christian Soldiers". With her was our other great leader, Mrs. Catt. The last speaker was former President Theodore Roosevelt. He had a habit of crumpling up each page of his speech as he finished reading it and throwing it violently on the floor, and before he was through balls of paper were scattered all about the feet and the long, long skirts of the row of us who were sitting just behind him.

The New York State Woman Suffrage Party had built up a huge organization. In our last parade up Fifth Avenue we had carried the signatures of one million New York State women.

It was too good an organization to let fall apart.

What should we do with it?

First, we must think up a new name to substitute for New York State Woman Suffrage Party. The name we finally chose was the New York State League of Women Voters.

Alice Duer Miller was the corresponding secretary and I was the recording secretary, and our chairman, Vera Whitehouse, appointed us a committee of two to draft a document setting forth the purposes of the new League of Women Voters. One of the purposes we set down stands out most clearly in my memory because it was our great mistake. It read something like this: "to further and to initiate legislation especially affecting women and children."

I was to remember the drafting of this clause with no little remorse.

What we suffragists had always been working for was not privilege and protection but justice and equality for women. We had worked to bring women out of the class with children and idiots, and now we had put up a signboard directing our course backward!

Meantime the American Federation of Labor had thought up something for our fine organization to do. They had thought up some legislation which, under the guise of protecting women in industry, would restrict them in competition for the jobs which men wanted for themselves.

The Women's Trade Union League, which was a group composed chiefly of well-to-do women having a sincere and earnest desire to help their less fortunate sisters, were convinced of the beneficial intent of these proposed bills. One of their leading spirits was Mary Dreier, who was also a member of our board of the League of Women Voters. Mary Dreier was and is, I think, one of the most warm-hearted idealists in the world, and through Mary Dreier was introduced to the board of the League of Women Voters, the American Federation of Labor's envoy, Rose Schneiderman. Rose Schneiderman was a nice person, too, and sincere as well as persuasive; in appearance a typical working woman, and it was easy enough for her to sell us the idea of the eight-hour day for women and the minimum wage for women. Every member of that board of the League of Women Voters was, I believe, inspired by the highest and most unselfish motives, as well as being filled with exultation over our recent victory and on tip-toe to hurry up and use our great organization to do good with.

Another circumstance was that practically every member of that original board of the League of Women Voters, with the exception of myself, was a woman of wealth and leisure, having had no personal experience with the problems of wage-earners.

Our minute books, recording years and years of meetings from the early days of the suffrage movement, were kept locked in a big old safe in our Fifth Avenue headquarters and every time I got my book out of the safe to record the doings of the current meeting I became more convinced that we had embarked on a wrong course.

For at that time I was living in my studio in McDougal Alley in a part of the town where my friends and associates were mostly women of the professions, and I found that these women, far from anticipating that such measures would be beneficial to women, saw them as constituting not only an indignity but a handicap. Even my charwoman could tell me how girls would lose the soft jobs and the well paid jobs, how the girls working in restaurants would not be allowed to work during the late hours where tips are large. They would not be eligible for the coveted overtime pay. They would not be allowed to operate elevators at night. The law has never prevented the strip-teasers and other entertainers of men from plying their trades at night, and women still retain the privilege of scrubbing floors all night long, even the floors of the elevators which they are not permitted to operate.

Nevertheless these bills, with our assistance, became law.

In the twenty-five years since then, the League of Women Voters has spread from New York State all over the country. They have done much splendid political, civic, and educational work, and those so-called protective laws for women have now lost the prominent place they once held in the League's program. Indeed in the light of the hardships shared by women in the war effort, the idea of protective laws has grown to seem rather quaint. And many of the Leagues' members now believe that if there ever was a time when those laws served a good purpose, that time has passed and it now behooves us to work together to abolish without more delay those thousand and forty injustices to women which still stand on the statute books of the states.

Those thousand and forty laws discriminating against women are a thousand and forty wrongs which can be righted by the one act of Congress in passing the amendment to our Constitution which is to read:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex."

Womanpower

Women increasingly are helping to slip ships down the ways toward an allied victory, War Manpower Commission reports. Fifteen per cent of shipyard workers are women, with Pacific Coast yards leading. In some yards there the number of women runs as high as 30 per cent.

Susy the Riveter and her sisters in war plants are leaving marks on industry, not only through their capable performance, but on the very looks of the plant. The women's bureau of the Department of Labor shows that the face of the machine shop has been lifted in many cases. In a large aircraft-engine plant, for example, inspection of cylinder barrels used to require moving the 50-pound gadget about by hand and, of course, required a hefty male for the job. Now women do the work alone by means of an especially designed tilted carriage on a wheeled platform. A small, light riveting gun and long handled wrenches (which take less strength than short handled ones) have also been turned out to order for the weaker sex.

Washington Shopping News, August 8, 1944.

A Victorian Amazon

By MIRIAM ALLEN DEFORD

In 1875, when Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton visited San Francisco, they paid a special formal call on a young school teacher at her school. It was well they did this, for that young school teacher was "the first woman anywhere in the world to receive as a salaried employee equal pay with men for equal work." Her name was Kate Kennedy, and she was principal of North Cosmopolitan School. Her status as a teacher and her standing in the community as a person active in the cause of justice, was her own accomplishment. She might have catered to the advocates of things as they are; or she might have been content with a more peaceful existence and less notoriety among the San Francisco politicians, but her code of action did not include calmness in the face of injustice to herself or her co-workers. She fought for her rights and every school teacher since her day has profited.

Kate Kennedy was born in Ireland in 1827. When she was 22 the family came to the United States and in 1856 they came to San Francisco, so Kate was "virtually a California pioneer." Her first teaching position was given her in 1856, and her rise from that time in her profession was steady and kept pace with her popularity among children and townspeople alike.

When she received the appointment to the principalship of North Cosmopolitan Grammar School, her first salary check did not please her. She had expected to receive the same amount as the man principal who had preceded her, but instead it was only what they paid the principal of a primary school. Kate was a pioneer woman suffragist. She belonged to a labor union, and did not hesitate to mount a soap box and explain her ideas to the public. She and other prominent suffragists of her day, among them Laura DeFord Gordon and Clara Shortridge Foltz, worked to right this great injustice to women teachers and in 1874 the following law was passed: "Females employed as teachers in the public schools of this state shall in all cases receive the same compensation as allowed male teachers for like services, when holding the same grade of certificate." In 1875 an attempt was made to repeal the law, but Kate Kennedy took time again to prevent this and succeeded.

After the passage and maintenance of this law, school boards all over the state took drastic courses in gymnastics so they could be agile and dexterous in side stepping this new rule. Alas in many cases they have succeeded unto this day. By giving the men and women a different set of duties, they claim that men and women do not perform "like services."

But Kate Kennedy was once more to achieve benefits for her fellow teachers. She was a stranger to fear, when she heard the voice of duty, and did not hesitate to mount a soap box and speak for striking unions. She herself belonged to the Knights of Labor, and she spoke for woman suffrage, and reform, against the railroad control of the state and political corruption. School boards of that time liked this sort of thing about as well as they do today. They wanted to put her in her rightful place. As she was very popular among great numbers of people and always took pains not to break any law, their only course could be one of trickery.

In 1887, being ill, she asked for two months' leave of absence, intending to return in May. As soon as her back was turned, so to speak, the reactionary forces of the city leaped to action. She was demoted from the North Cosmopolitan School to a much smaller one on the outskirts of the city, and on May 18 was dismissed from the school force altogether. Kate smoothed her gray hair, lifted her chin and returned the challenge. She sued the city for reinstatement to her old position, and for all the back pay due from the time of her transfer. For three years she kept to her goal and in 1890 the State Supreme Court rendered its decision: "A teacher of any particular grade and with a proper certificate cannot be placed in a lower grade or dismissed except for misconduct or incompetency." This is the basis for the present teacher tenure law of California. On her suit for back pay she received a check for $5,700.75, the largest salary warrant ever issued to a teacher in San Francisco.

Added to her poor health and declining years the effort she made to win this battle for posterity was too much for her and she died a few weeks later. The West's first martyr to the cause of women, and a pioneer for justice and fair play whose name should be honored whenever the roll of great women is read. (From *They Were San Franciscans.*)

The Weaker Sex

THE BOERS OF SOUTH AFRICA

Editor's Note: Dr. J. E. Holloway, Secretary of the Treasury of the Union of South Africa, a Boer (the name given to South Africans with a Dutch ancestry, Boer being Dutch word for farmer), made the singular remark that among Boers there are no jokes against the mother-in-law, who is regarded as a person deserving of every respect. Interested in this side light, the editor asked Dr. Holloway to write the following article.

By DR. J. E. HOLLOWAY

Boer women hold a high position. There is no element of subservience—except in so far as a woman elects 'to stoop to conquer."

The Boer women have played a very important part in the pioneering of the country. In their Ox-Wagons, similar to the Covered Wagon, which opened up your Middle West, they trekked into country inhabited by warlike savages and teeming with game, lions, leopards and elephants. In the great monument which has recently been erected in the capitol, Pretoria, to commemorate this "Great Trek" a giant sculpture of a woman and her children symbolizes the march of civilization—for it is only where the white man takes his own womenfolk with him and does not resort to miscengenation, that the purity of white civilization is maintained.

And in that great pioneer venture, the woman played a noble and courageous part. At one stage where a large number of their best men had been treacherously massacred by the Zulus, and the rest were losing heart and talking of retreat, it was the women who took a firm stand and declared that they would rather be massacred themselves than let their murdered husbands, sons and sweethearts remain unavenged. Thus they prepared the way for the decisive victory of civilization over barbarism at the Battle of Blood River in 1838.

When the spirit of freedom is borne by the bearers of the race it will never die, because it is renewed in full vigour from generation to generation.

The Think Tank, September 7, 1944.

Farm Woman's Letter

THERE'S STILL A FRONTIER

Dear Editor: We moved to Clark's Fork River Valley, "The Last Frontier of America," at the western edge of Montana, a year and a half ago, and are finding it a most interesting place. It has been heavily timbered, and is now slowly being converted to agriculture. As one Forest Ranger told me, "every clearing in the forest implies an adventure. It may prove to be the home of a Harvard man, a drought refugee, a lumberjack or a millionaire."

Distances are impressive, even in normal times. Under gas rationing they are almost insurmountable. We are three and a half miles from a Post Office, 20 from a shopping center, 120 from a hospital or efficient doctor.

Women are doing amazing things in this wild new country. The Look-Out stations, which watch for forest fires, are being "manned" by women. This means that a woman must live quite alone on a mountain top for three months, carry her own water as much as half a mile, chop all of her own wood and do some "trail brushing" during rainy weather. Savage electrical storms sweep over the Look-Outs, so that electricity leaps from bolt to bolt of the structure, the stove lids dance, and the "look-out" herself must lie on the floor, rising up occasionally to look for 'hot-strikes" over the countryside.

Our coroner is a woman, the undertaker is a woman, the Health Officer, serving an area 80 by 125 miles, is a woman. We also have a dainty little County Nurse who valiantly serves this large region. Throughout the mountain area there are scattered little stores that serve as post offices. Most of these are operated by women, and this woman also seems to constitute a "guardian angel" for her community, passing on local news (most people have no 'phones), seeing that anyone in distress is given attention, and in general guiding the destiny of the community.

The country is seemingly adapted to dairying, and every family has milk cows. From grandmothers to primary girls, the feminine population milks. There are no young men left in the country. The percentage of men rejected for physical disabilities is very low here, the young boys have all enlisted, young fathers are being drafted. All of the people in this country are "dead shots," because of our natural hunting resources.

This is the center of the deer population of the United States. We counted 110 deer on our ranch last winter during the heavy snows. Several of them fed with our dairy cattle every day. Beaver are so numerous that they are a problem. We trapped twenty last winter, and I plan to have a fur coat made from beaver taken on the ranch.—Edith Benninghoven, Montana.

From Farm Journal and Farmer's Wife, May, 1944.

Women Serving In Pacific

By GRETCHEN SMITH

American women "can take it" as well as the men serving in the Pacific islands battle areas, where mud, insects, rain and snakes run a close second in the way of discomfort to the menace of Jap fire, Lt. Col. Jane Clements, Army Nurse Corps, told members of the Soroptimist Club yesterday.

On temporary duty in Washington awaiting orders, Colonel Clements has just returned from two years in the South Pacific, where she saw service in Australia, New Guinea and numerous island outposts.

Head of the Army Nurse Corps in that area, she described numerous details of life among women serving with the armed forces in the Pacific area.

She told of one young nurse who returned to her tent one evening to find a huge python coiled in the ceiling ropes. Without calling for help or making any disturbance she picked up her machete and cut the snake in two. Snakes and insects are numerous, but hold no terror for the nurses, Colonel Clements said. Neither do their surroundings suppress their feminine desire for attractive homes, she continued. Nurses' tents are converted into cozy living quarters by the use of colorful, discarded parachutes, brightly stenciled sacking and other decorations.

"No matter where she goes, the nurse always carries along one evening dress," Colonel Clements smiled. "However, there has been little use for these dresses in the Pacific so the girls use them for drapes, hangings or gay bedspreads."

Bulldozers and the Army jeep are in her opinion the "two most wonderful inventions of the war," Colonel Clements continued.

Jungle thicknesses are cleared within a short period by use of bulldozers, she explained, and in the clearings the Army hospitals are erected.

The speaker told how Army nurses adopt baby kangaroos as pets after they have been abandoned by frightened mothers.

"The girls fix up nursing bottles for them and the little kangaroos who must sleep in a pouch are placed in a sock at night and hung up next to the nurse's cots. They make great pets," she commented.

High praise was given by the speaker to American women engaged in war work at home.

"The women working here won't get any badges for their work," she said. "Working 8 to 10 hours in a maternity ward or in other vital work does not have the excitement that one gets in the life at the front, but it is just as important. It's mighty easy to be great where the big show is going on, but the work you women are doing here at home is equal to the work we are doing at the front."

—*Washington Star*, June 29, 1944.

Dame Ethel Mary Smyth

Noted British Suffragist Dies

Members of the National Woman's Party, and especially those who were connected with the early woman suffrage campaign, were saddened by the news of the passing, May 8, of Dame Ethel Mary Smyth, English composer, writer and militant suffragist. Her life story became entwined with the National Woman's Party when American women followed in the footsteps of the militant group led by Mrs. Pankhurst in England and adopted militant tactics here.

Dame Smyth was a composer of no mean attainment and prestige, but she probably reached the apex of her dramatic career when she wrote "The March of the Women," which became known as the Marseillaise of the suffrage movement. The song was heard frequently in the streets of London as rebellious women joined in a demand for their rights.

When she was imprisoned in Holloway Jail in London in 1913, that song became the inspiration battlecry of the suffragists. The song was sung by her defiant fellow prisoners, marching around the prison yard in their daily exercises as she beat time for them through the bars of her cell, using her toothbrush as a baton. Although England rewarded her genius at that time with imprisonment, when woman suffrage had been won, she was rewarded with the title of "Dame of the British Empire."

RECEIPTS — NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS, August 1 to September 30, 1944

Finance Chairman Florence A. Armstrong

Treasurer Laura Berrien

CONTRIBUTIONS AND MEMBERSHIP FEES

Mrs. Elizabeth T. Kent, Calif.	$ 290.00
Mrs. Elizabeth S. Rogers, N. Y. C.	200.00
Delaware Branch National Woman's Party	200.00
Mrs. Elizabeth Chevalier, Calif.	100.00
Mrs. Gertrude Gates, D. C.	100.00
Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, N. Y. C.	100.00
Miss Georgia Lloyd, N. J.	100.00
Georgia O'Keefe, N. Y. C.	100.00
Mrs. Ruth Robinson Roach, Mo.	100.00
Miss Alice Morgan Wright, N. Y.	100.00
Mrs. John T. Bissell, D. C.	50.00
Mrs. Charlotte H. Delafield, N. Y. C.	50.00
Mrs. Mary McHenry Keith, Calif.	50.00
Miss Alma Lutz, N. Y.	50.00
Dr. Rosalie S. Morton, Fla.	50.00
Mrs. J. E. Osborne, Iowa	50.00
Mrs. Anna Kelton Wiley, D. C.	50.00
Miss Jeanette Marks, N. Y.	28.00
Louis K. Anspacher, N. Y.	25.00
Mrs. Nora Stanton Barney, Conn.	25.00
Mrs. Judson Bowns, Mass.	25.00
Robert J. Caldwell, N. Y. C.	25.00
Miss Emma T. Hahm, D. C.	25.00
Adelaide F. Hawley, N. Y. C.	25.00
Mrs. E. M. Knapp, Mass.	25.00
Mrs. Josephine N. Keal, Mich.	25.00
Matthews and Berrien, D. C.	25.00
Michigan Branch National Women's Party	25.00
Mrs. Redfield Proctor, Vt.	25.00
Mrs. Ogden Reid, N. Y. C.	25.00
Mrs. Thurston Roberts, Fla.	25.00
Mrs. Worthington Scranton, Scranton, Penna.	25.00
Mrs. Ella M. Sherwin, N. Y.	25.00
Mrs. Edna A. Stone, Ohio	25.00
Mrs. Alice F. Schott, N. Y. C.	25.00
Miss Mary Brandon, Ohio	20.00
Business and Professional Women's Council, Baltimore, Md.	20.00
Miss Wenona Marlin, N. Y. C.	20.00
Mrs. Zaio Woodford Schroeder, Mich.	20.00
Elsa L. Stebbings, Calif.	20.00
Mrs. Una R. Winter, Calif.	20.00
Mrs. Phoebe C. Munnecke, Mich.	19.00
Mrs. Edna S. Capewell, N. Y.	15.00
Miss Anne F. Carter, D. C.	15.00
Mrs. George Cohen, N. Y. C.	15.00
Miss Lavinia Dock, Conn.	15.00
Walter S. Kemeys, N. J.	15.00
Miss Laura M. Berrien, D. C.	12.00
Mrs. Amelia H. Walker, Md.	11.00
Mrs. Katheryn L. Brougham, Md.	10.50
American Women's Society of Public Accountants	10.00
Alpha Iota Sorority (national)	10.00
Mrs. Nina Allender, Ill.	10.00
Imo P. Baughman, Calif.	10.00
Mrs. Ed. F. Bennett, Wyo.	10.00
Edith H. Bill, Md.	10.00
Mrs. Eloise P. Bingham, Ill.	10.00
Kate Brown, N. Y.	10.00
Miss Aurelle Burnside, Ark.	10.00
Mrs. W. F. Carey, Sr., N. Y. C.	10.00
Mrs. Dwight Clark, N. Y. C.	10.00
Lelia F. Dame	10.00
Annette Means, Mich.	10.00
Miss Edith M. Lower, D. C.	10.00
Miss L. J. C. Daniels, Vt.	10.00
Catherine R. Dobbs, Ohio	10.00
Eleanor Duncan, D. C.	10.00
Mrs. Elizabeth Fain, Mass.	10.00
Genevieve M. Fuller, Mass.	10.00
Mrs. Lucia Grimes, Mich.	10.00
Miss Mabel Griswold, Wisc.	10.00
Lucia Hadley, D. C.	10.00
Mrs. M. Lucretia Hayden, Iowa	10.00
Florence R. Hazeltine, Md.	10.00
Mrs. Katherine H. Hepburn, Conn.	10.00
Elizabeth H. Hooker, Md.	10.00
Miss Olive E. Hurlburt, Mich.	10.00
Mrs. Zelma Huxtable, Calif.	10.00
Mary B. Jackson, Iowa	10.00
Miss Vivian Kellems, Conn.	10.00
Mrs. Roy W. Kreuger	10.00
Ethel Traphagen Leigh, N. Y. C.	10.00
Mrs. Ethel Irwin Lineweaver, Va.	10.00
Mrs. Julia M. Mann, Calif.	10.00
Carol L. Marx, Minn.	10.00
Miss Alice Matthews, D. C.	10.00
Miss Louise McLean, Calif.	10.00
Ruth Lundeen Memmler, Calif.	10.00
National Council of Women Chiropracters	10.00
Osteopathic Women's National Association	10.00
Miss Kate Oglebay, N. Y. C.	10.00
Miss Margaret Plummer, D. C.	10.00
Ruth J. Powers, D. C.	10.00
May E. Reid, N. Y.	10.00
Mrs. Katherine Riede, Md.	10.00
Mrs. Gertrude Robey, Va.	10.00
Dr. Helena T. Ratterman, Ohio	10.00
Mrs. E. R. A. Seligman, N. Y. C.	10.00
Miss May Christine Sickmon, N. Y.	10.00
Mrs. Wilhelmina Schwaiger, Pa.	10.00
Mrs. Lucille Sorensen, Mo.	10.00
Dr. Elizabeth Taylor, Texas	10.00
Mrs. Emma H. Townsend, Texas	10.00
Mrs. J. Russell Williams, N. Y. C.	10.00
Joy L. Webster, Washington, D. C.	10.00
Dr. Alice Stone Wooley, N. Y.	10.00
Marion P. Whitney, Conn.	10.00
Josepha Whitney, Conn.	10.00
Mary Billings Green, Conn.	10.00
Mrs. Dorothy S. Granger, Md.	6.00
Virginia Bedell, Iowa	5.00
Edna C. Bowyer, D. C.	5.00
Mrs. Jane W. Bustard, D. C.	5.00
Mrs. Eleanor K. Bruce, Tenn.	5.00
E. P. Brown, Ohio	5.00
Miss Edith K. Braman, N. Y. C.	5.00
Capt. R. Cross, N. Y. C.	5.00
Miss Rita M. Cowan, N. Y.	5.00
Arabel W. Clark, Pa.	5.00
Mrs. A. R. Colvin, Minn.	5.00
Chesapeake Beach (Md.) Women's Club	5.00
Mrs. Ona A. Crume, Minn.	5.00
Mrs. Taraknath Das, N. Y. C.	5.00
Mrs. Joseph Y. Denny, Ohio	5.00
Miss Mildred A. Drach, Calif.	5.00
Mrs. Florence Edwards, N. Y. C.	5.00
Rebecca Eggers, Ill.	5.00
Elizabeth Fairall, D. C.	5.00
Fannie Fink, N. Y. C.	5.00
Welthy Honsinger Fisher, Mass.	5.00
Mrs. J. E. Fries, Mass.	5.00
Miss Mary Gawthorpe, N. Y.	5.00
Mrs. Karl Green, D. C.	5.00
Mrs. Mary Confehr Grove, Pa.	5.00
Mrs. Edith F. Gordon, N. Y. C.	5.00
Dr. Maude Glasgow, N. Y. C.	5.00
Mrs. C. K. Gleason, Conn.	5.00
Cornelia H. Hill, Md.	5.00
Mrs. Louise M. Henely, Ia.	5.00
Miss Julia Hewitt, Wisc.	5.00
Miss Edith Hooker, Md.	5.00
Mr. G. Hovnanian, Tenn.	5.00
Miss Pearl L. Hyde, Calif.	5.00
Mrs. E. L. Hughes, Mich.	5.00
John R. Insinger, Jr., Tenn.	5.00
Carol Insinger, Tenn.	5.00
Miss E. Jack, D. C.	5.00
Dr. Edith E. Johnson, Calif.	5.00
Mrs. Mildred R. Kelley, N. Y. C.	5.00
Dr. Linda B. Lange, Pa.	5.00
Clara B. Lyberger, Ore.	5.00
Mrs. Marjorie R. Longwell, Calif.	5.00
Miss Grace Merriam, N. Y.	5.00
Miss Edith Lumsden, D. C.	5.00
Helen S. Merriam, N. Y.	5.00
Dorothy McChesney, Fla.	5.00
Mrs. Gerritt S. Miller, D. C.	5.00
Mrs. Lucile Michie, Va.	5.00
Mrs. Mark C. Neil, Ill.	5.00
Marguerite Nuendorf, Iowa	5.00
Dr. Nelle S. Noble, Iowa	5.00
Charles D. Osborne, N. Y.	5.00
Parry Haines Paul, Pa.	5.00
Mrs. Harry H. Power, Texas	5.00
Miss Sylvia F. Porter, N. Y.	5.00
Miss Olive Pryor, N. Y.	5.00
Mary Quinn, Ohio	5.00
Fannie Ratchford, Texas	5.00
Florence Rogatz, N. Y. C.	5.00
John Sanders, Jr., N. Y. C.	5.00
Margaret Saxe, Dela.	5.00
Savannah (Ga.) Business and Professional Women's Club	5.00
Beatrice D. Scott, Calif.	5.00
Gertrude Stenner, Iowa	5.00
Alma Jane Speer, D. C.	5.00
Mrs. H. M. Shackelford, Conn.	5.00
Elizabeth A. Stone, Mich.	5.00
Mrs. Elizabeth B. Schlesinger, Mass.	5.00
Mary Church Terrell, D. C.	5.00
Mrs. Josephine Terrill, Calif.	5.00
Dr. Josephine E. Vanderwolff, Ill.	5.00
Mrs. Helen Vandenberg, Iowa	5.00
Miss Mattie Watson, Ia.	5.00
Grayce Ward, Minn.	5.00
Helen Wetzel, N. J.	5.00
Mrs. Hattie Winters Messinger, Ariz.	5.00
Beatrice H. Westerlind, Md.	5.00
Women Chiropractors' Club, Detroit, Mich.	5.00
Mrs. George H. Zimmerman, Mich.	5.00
Mrs. Bernice Fervow, S. C.	4.00
Mrs. R. A. Isenberg, Calif.	4.00
Marjorie Varner, Fla.	4.00
Mrs. Lilian Aaron, Md.	3.00
Mrs. B. B. Chase, D. C.	3.00
Mrs. Samuel Cohen, Ohio	3.00
Mrs. Harold J. Coyer, Mich.	3.00
John B. Barker, D. C.	3.00
Miss Margaretta L. Dwight, R. I.	3.00
Francis E. Pickett, M. D., Ohio	3.00
Mrs. A. D. Neale, Va.	3.00
Marjorie G. Smith, Mich.	3.00
Miss Gladys Webster, N. H.	3.00
Delphine Zell, Ore.	3.00
Mrs. B. Homer Emerson, Mass.	2.00
Mrs. Esther Cloward, N. Y.	2.00
Kathleen Davison, Ia.	2.00
Mrs. Mary W. P. Grammer, N. J.	2.00
Florence Josephine Kelley, Ohio	2.00
Mrs. Sophia T. Keer, Pa.	2.00
Maude Herrold, Mo.	2.00
Grace Hoffman, Md.	2.00
Luella S. Laudin, N. Y.	2.00
Miss Marie F. Moss, D. C.	2.00
Mrs. M. S. Alderton, Palo Alto, Calif.	2.00
Maxine McBride, Mich.	2.00
Mrs. A. M. Newbold, D. C.	2.00
Mrs. Irving E. Outcalt, Calif.	2.00
Miss Helen Paul, Conn.	2.00
Jessie D. Patton, D. C.	2.00
Gwendolyn B. Penniman, Calif.	2.00
Dr. Inez F. Philbrick, Ohio	2.00
Miss Julia M. Pollitzer, N. Y. C.	2.00
Mrs. Michael D. Pierce	2.00

(Continued on Page 75)

More Governors Endorse Amendment

Since the last issue of Equal Rights several additional Governors have endorsed the Equal Rights Amendment. There are now 17 Republican Governors who have made public statements in support of the Amendment, and 10 Democratic Governors. In addition to those previously published are the following:

August 3, 1944.

Governor Sidney P. Osborn (Democrat), Arizona: "I give my endorsement to the proposed Equal Rights Amendment to the Federal Constitution, and I am pleased to do so, sincerely and wholeheartedly. I am enclosing a copy of the platform of the Democratic Party of Arizona, adopted a few days ago. You will note it contains a strong plank relative to equal rights for women. This is particularly significant in view of the fact that the present state legislature of Arizona is composed entirely of members of the Democratic Party."

September 30, 1944.

Governor Simeon Willis (Republican), Kentucky: "The Republican Platform this year, consistently with the Party's position for many years, endorsed the proposal for an equal rights amendment to the Federal Constitution. I endorsed this action at the National Convention of the Federated Republican Women's Club, Louisville, on September 8 of this year. It is my hope that the Congress may submit this Amendment promptly and that it may be ratified by every state in the Union. Unfortunately, I cannot predict the action of the General Assembly of Kentucky to be elected next year, but I shall endeavor to persuade that body of the justice and propriety of prompt approval."

October 4, 1944.

Governor Robert S. Kerr (Democrat), Oklahoma: "I am glad to inform you that the Amendment has my unqualified endorsement. For your information, I am glad to advise you that my own State of Oklahoma adopted a Constitutional Amendment, voted on by the people in 1942, giving to women equal rights with men to hold any office within the State from Governor down. At that time I was candidate for Governor and the Amendment had my whole-hearted support."

August 2, 1944.

Governor John Moses (Democrat), North Dakota: "I was a member of the Platform and Resolutions Committee of the Democratic National Convention, and supported the Amendment in the Committee. I believe it is fair and just, and I believe it ought to be enacted into law."

August 15, 1944.

Governor J. Howard McGrath (Democrat), Rhode Island: "I am happy to endorse this measure which the Democratic Party has seen fit to include in its Democratic Party Platform."

September 7, 1944.

Governor Olin D. Johnston (Democrat), South Carolina: "I wish to endorse fully the equal rights plank for women in the National Democratic Platform. This is a step forward in regard to the consideration of women's participation in the life of our country. I am very pleased that the Democratic Party stands solidly in favor of this action."

August 30, 1944.

Governor Herbert B. Maw (Democrat), Utah: "I personally very much approve of the equal rights amendment to the Constitution and will do whatever I can to bring about its adoption. Utah has always taken a lead in promoting equal rights for women. While it was yet a territory and long before most of the states in the Union realized the value of equal rights, Utah established women in their rightful place in government. Whatever we out here can do to assist the women of the nation to enjoy the privileges they should, will be done. I think we will have no difficulty in convincing the legislature of our State that it should support the Amendment."

RECEIPTS — NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS, August 1 to September 30, 1944

(Continued from Page 74)

Mrs. Kenyon H. Rector, Ohio	2.00
Mrs. Laura Shaffron, Mich	2.00
Mrs. Helen A. Stewart, D. C	2.00
Mrs. Evelyn Stead, Ga	2.00
Mary Ansley Short, D. C	2.00
Miss Lizabeth Wiley, Wyo	2.00
Mrs. Robert F. Hudson, Va	1.75
Margaret C. Moss, Ohio	1.50
Mrs. J. C. Williams, Ohio	1.50
Mrs. Rhea D. Foster, D. C	1.25
Aura Lee Ageton, Calif	1.00
Dr. Rosalind Moore Bain, D. C	1.00
Mrs. Page Belcher, Okla	1.00
Mrs. Mary Lou Brooks, N. Y. C	1.00
Miss Viola R. Collins	1.00
Genevieve Cowles, Conn	1.00
Mrs. Anna Darr, Ind	1.00
Mrs. Josephine Dietlin, Mich	1.00
Miss Katharine W. Fisher, Mass	1.00
Mrs. A. Gordon Fleet, Md	1.00
Mrs. Mary Glass, Conn	1.00
Mrs. Charles S. Gutermuth, N. Y	1.00
Harriet Howe, Calif	1.00
Christine Kefauver, N. Y. C	1.00
Miss Alice Keith, D. C	1.00
Katherine Link, Mich	1.00
Mrs. Charles R. Lisle, N. Y	1.00
Bessie Locke, N. Y. C	1.00
Mrs. E. G. McKenzie, D. C	1.00
Matha McKay, Mich	1.00
Lt. Col. Agnes H. McKernan, N. Y. C	1.00
Miss Helena M. Nye, Calif	1.00
Miss Mildred Roach, Calif	1.00
Miss Ruth M. Roach, Mo	1.00
Mrs. A. M. Royer, D. C	1.00
Rev. F. A. Teed, Mich	1.00
Miss Mildred Taylor, Calif	1.00
Mrs. Louise Zeigler, Tenn	1.00
Total contributions and membership fees	$3,562.50

ENROLLMENT FEES

Mrs. John T. Armstrong, Ill.; Mrs. Louise M. Adams, Md.; Mrs. Frances M. Beresford, Ill.; Miss Mabel A. Bedell, Nebr.; Margaret Brady, Nebr.; Elizabeth L. Britton, Nebr.; Mrs. Lucile A. Calmes, D. C.; Mrs. Caroline E. Coates, Md.; Mary L. Collard, Nebr.; Miss Louise Daly, Calif.; Mrs. Laura Dolan, Texas; Courtney E. Dale, Nebr.; Pearl Doncho, Nebr.; Dr. Margaret J. Fisher, N. Y.; Mildred Gustason, Nebr.; Miss Sylvia Sterling Grad, Md.; Mrs. Robert F. Hudson, Va.; Myrtle M. Hicks, Nebr.; Mrs. Ethel Hunsaker, Nebr.; Mrs. Isabel K. Hotchkiss, Calif.; Mrs. Gerda Isenberg. Calif.; Miss Muriel Kriel, Md.; Helen Jugelt, N. Y.; Mrs. Eva Knowles, Texas.; Ellen Kelley, Nebr.; Helen Mary Knox, Ill.; Mrs. Ethel Lusk, Texas.; Ethel Lavering, Nebr.; Alice Y. Liljegren, Nebr.; Mrs. Grace McComb, Texas.; Dr. Esther McEachen, Nebr.; Helene M. Miles, Nebr.; Myrtle H. Mortensen, Nebr.; Mrs. Franklin Miller, Ill.; Mrs. Anna Jane Phillips, N. Y.; Mabel H. Plummer, Nebr.; Grace Thayer Raines, Nebr.; Miss Emma E. Raggs, Md.; Mrs. A. J. Rasmussen, Nebr.; Avis Roberts, Nebr.; Miss Agnes S. Richter, Md.; Miss Grace Scott, Ala.; Miss Edle Stager, Calif.; Mrs. Walker J. Schoomaker, N. Y.; Mrs. Odette Smith, Texas; Zella R. Sahn, Nebr.; Mrs. Sidney Smith, Nebr.; Helen A. Tag, Nebr.; Mrs. Harriet W. Tipton, Md.; Mrs. Marguerite Fisher, Md.; Mrs. George W. White, Ill.; Iva Winterfield, Nebr.; Mrs. Margaret Zilliacus, Md.

Total enrollment fees		$ 13.25

OTHER RECEIPTS

Transfer from Investment and Endowment Fund	$6,000.00	
Income from Investment and Endowment Fund	1,000.00	
Rent of rooms at National Headquarters	986.30	
Subscriptions to Equal Rights	179.90	
Sale of Literature	42.55	
Miscellaneous Receipts (including votes on Painting)	24.58	
Total other receipts		$ 8,233.33
GRAND TOTAL, Receipts		$11,809.08

A Feminist Thinks It Over

By ALMA LUTZ

An Alert For Married-Women Workers

IN these days when in the press and over the radio there are constant calls for women workers, young and old, married or single, we are apt to forget that only six years ago married-women workers were frowned upon throughout the country and particularly in Massachusetts. A recent decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Court has brought back memories of injustices to married-women workers when their right to work was challenged and when they were obliged to ask themselves, "Can working women marry?"

During the last depression married women in Massachusetts were barred from employment in city departments and in the schools; business and industry followed suit, and bills were introduced in the Legislature which attempted by law to ban further the employment of married women. In 1938 six competent, married-women employees of the City of Somerville, Massachusetts, were dismissed after an ordinance had been passed banning the employment of married women. These women, feeling that women's right to work in a democracy was as inviolate as men's, took their case to the Courts. For six years they have waited for justice. Now at last Massachusetts has partially redeemed its past bad record through a Supreme Court decision which declares this ordinance invalid. The decision, as reported in the press, states specifically, that this ordinance forbidding employment of married women in city departments is invalid because "it deprives married women of their constitutional right to equal opportunity for selection for public employment on grounds having no substantial relation to public welfare." This is a gratifying victory for married women and the six Somerville women who contested their dismissal are to be congratulated on their courage and persistence. They have made a real contribution to the economic freedom of women.

However, their victory is only a partial victory, for the Court did not go the whole way on the employment of married women. It pointed out clearly that this ruling in no way interferes with a previous opinion which held that married women might be banned as school teachers. "School committees," declared the Court, "have discretion in the case of teachers, because married women in some public employments may be considered less qualified than unmarried women." The conclusion to be drawn from this decision, it seems to me, is that a law barring married women from paid employment is unconstitutional but that there are ways of getting around this. In other words, if public opinion can be made to fall in line with the theory that married women are less efficient workers than single women, then their dismissal can be arranged.

Married-women school teachers still have a battle ahead in Massachusetts, and particularly in Boston, where they have been refused employment even during the acute shortage of teachers. Their best hope is the adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment which will not only strengthen throughout the whole country married women's constitutional right to equal opportunity for public employment or service, but will have a powerful effect on public opinion in the direction of equal opportunity and justice for women.

Florence Bayard Hilles Library

MARY ELIZABETH DOWNEY, *Librarian*

Since the time of the endorsement of the Equal Rights Amendment by the General Federation of Women's Clubs, letters have been received from clubs all over the country, asking for suitable programs, with references for study on the subject.

Appreciation of what the woman movement is about is a matter of education which can be obtained by listening to those enlightened on the subject and by reading books which encourage thought and lead one to apply what is learned to personal experience.

Reading the following books in the sequence given will afford a comprehensive knowledge of the long journey women have taken toward the attainment of human rights: *"The Subjection of Women and the Traditions of Men,"* 1940, by Maude Glasgow, M.D., Ph.D.,; *Angels and Amazons; A Hundred Years of American Women,* 1933, by Inez Haynes Irwin; *"Created Equal; The Biography of Elizabeth Cady Stanton,"* 1940, by Alma Lutz; *"Jailed for Freedom,"* 1920, by Doris Stevens; *"The Story of the Woman's Party,"* 1921, by Inez Haynes Irwin; *"Challenging Years; The Memoirs of Harriet Stanton Blatch,"* 1940, by Alma Lutz.

Such reading and club study play an important part in stimulating knowledge of the long, slow trail along which women, following men, have come in their evolution toward the complete emancipation yet to be accomplished.

Everyone who can influence such club study may have an important part in distributing the leaven which must work as a means of education throughout the United States in order that the general public may be prepared to pass the Equal Rights Amendment, when it comes up for ratification before the State legislatures, after its passage through Congress. Therefore we are most happy to assist clubs taking up this study with suggestions for programs and references for study.

In addition to such assistance, material also may be secured from encyclopedias, periodical files and biographies in local libraries. To do this, consult catalogues and indexes and ask librarians to assist in finding material. Along with the suggested program have current events talks on the progress of women and the Equal Rights Amendment at each meeting. Give radio talks on the subject when the opportunity offers. Secure all the newspaper publicity possible on this theme. Ask for current material from the National Woman's Party Headquarters. Subscribe to Equal Rights Magazine.

Suggested Yearly Program

January 3—Lucretia Mott's Birthday. **February** 15—Susan B. Anthony's Birthday. **March**—Pioneers in the United States, e. g., Margaret Brent, Ann Hutchinson, Abigail Adams, Mercy Warren, Sara Josepha Hale, Lucy Stone, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, May Wright Sewell, and Margaret Fuller Ossoli. **April**—Forerunners in England, e. g., Mary Astell, Mary Wolstonecraft, Josephine Butler, John Stuart Mill, Emeline Pankhurst, and Emeline Pethick-Lawrence. **May** — The Woman Movement in other countries. A comparison between the present condition of women in the Allied and Axis countries, with what it was before the war would be most enlightening. Study especially the women of Russia, China, and the Latin American countries. **June**—Pathfinders in the professions and industries, e. g., Medicine, Drs. Elizabeth and Emily Blackwell; Education, Catherine Beecher, Emma Willard, Mary Lyon, and M. Carey Thomas. Religion, Anna Howard Shaw, the Rev. Olympia Brown, and Catholic and Jewish leaders. Women in the Law. **July** 19—Declaration of Women's Rights, Seneca Falls Convention. **August** 26—Woman Suffrage Amendment Ratification Day. Show how women thought the vote would give them everything, later to find out that they had only the vote, not equality with men under the law. **September**—Feminist authors, past and present. Discussion of their lives and works and review of their books, e. g., Virginia Wolfe, Pearl Buck, Inez Haynes Irwin, and Elizabeth Robins. **October**—The National Woman's Party and the Equal Rights Amendment. Our sponsoring groups. Present day feminists in the United States. The Florence Bayard Hilles Library as a forerunner of other feminist libraries. **November** 12—Elizabeth Cady Stanton's birthday. **December**—The World Woman's Party, study of the present status of women throughout the world. Copies of the Resolution to be presented to the heads of allied governments may be studied and as many signatures as possible secured. Present day feminists in other countries.

Additions to the program might be United States feminists of our own time; The Youth Movement; Feminist Prospects; Emancipation of Women Today; Women and the War; Courses on the Woman Movement in Colleges and Universities: Goucher, American University, Russell Sage College, and Syracuse University.